

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

RONALD L. OLSON  
 ROBERT E. DENHAM  
 JEFFREY I. WEINBERGER  
 CARY B. LERMAN  
 GREGORY A. LONE  
 BRAD D. BRIAN  
 BRADLEY C. PHILLIPS  
 GEORGE M. GARVEY  
 WILLIAM D. TEMKO  
 JOHN W. SPIEGEL  
 DONALD B. VERRILLI, JR.\*  
 TERRY E. SANCHEZ  
 STEVEN M. PERRY  
 MARIE B. HELM  
 JOSEPH D. LEE  
 MICHAEL R. DOYEN  
 MICHAEL E. SOLOFF  
 KAREN E. MC'DOWELL  
 GLENN T. POMERANTZ  
 THOMAS B. WALPER  
 HENRY WEISSMANN  
 KEVIN S. ALLRED  
 JEFFREY A. HEINTZ  
 JUDITH T. KITANO  
 JEROME C. ROTH  
 GARTH T. VINCENT  
 TED DANE  
 STEPHEN N. SENATOR  
 MARTIN D. BERN  
 ROBERT L. DELL ANGELO  
 JONATHAN E. ALTMAN  
 KELLY M. KLAUS  
 DAVID B. GOLDMAN  
 DAVID H. FRY  
 LISA J. DEMSKY  
 MALCOLM A. HEINICKE  
 JAMES C. RUTTEN  
 RICHARD ST. JOHN  
 ROHT K. SINGLA  
 LUIS LI  
 CAROLYN HOECKER LUEDTKE  
 C. DAVID LEE  
 MARIA K. KIM  
 BRETT J. RODDA\*  
 FRED A. ROWLEY, JR.  
 KATHERINE M. FORSTER  
 BLANCA FROMM YOUNG  
 ROSEMARIE T. RING  
 SETH GOLDMAN  
 GRANT A. DAVIS-DENNY  
 JONATHAN H. BLAVIN  
 DANIEL B. LEVIN

MIRIAM KIM  
 MISTY M. SANFORD  
 HALYNN J. CHEN  
 BETHANY W. KRISTOVICH  
 JACOB S. KREIKAMP  
 JEFFREY YU  
 LAURA D. SMOLOWE  
 ANJAN CHAUDHURY  
 KYLE E. JACK  
 HEATHER E. TAKAHASHI  
 ERIN J. COX  
 BENJAMIN J. HORWICH  
 E. MARTIN ESTRADA  
 MATTHEW A. MACDONALD  
 BRYAN H. HECKENLIVELY  
 ELAINE J. GOLDENBERG\*  
 MARK R. YOHalem  
 GINGER D. ANDERS\*  
 MARGARET G. MARASCHINO  
 JOHN M. GILDERSLEEVE  
 ADAM B. WEISS  
 GEORGE CLAYTON FATHEREE, III  
 KELLY L.C. KRIEBA  
 JEREMY A. LAWRENCE  
 LAUREN L. LEE  
 ACHUTU J. PHADKE  
 ZACHARY M. BRIERS  
 JENNIFER M. BRODER  
 KURUVILLA J. OLASA  
 JUSTIN P. RAPHAEL  
 ROSE LEDA EHLER  
 ERIC P. TUTTLE  
 JOHN W. BERRY  
 ROBYN K. BACON  
 JORDAN D. SEGALL  
 DAVID S. HONG  
 JONATHAN KRAVIS\*  
 KAREN A. LORANG  
 JOHN L. SCHWAB  
 EMILY C. CURRAN-HUBERTY  
 MATTHEW S. SCHONHOLZ  
 WESLEY T.L. BURRELL  
 CRAIG JENNINGS LAVOIE  
 JENNIFER L. BRYANT  
 ANDREW CATH RUBENSTEIN  
 NICHOLAS D. FRAM  
 ASHLEY D. KAPLAN  
 JESSICA REICH BARIL  
 JULIANA M. YEE

350 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE  
 FIFTIETH FLOOR  
 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071-3426  
 TELEPHONE (213) 683-9100  
 FACSIMILE (213) 687-3702

560 MISSION STREET  
 TWENTY-SEVENTH FLOOR  
 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-3089

TELEPHONE (415) 512-4000  
 FACSIMILE (415) 512-4077

601 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE NW  
 SUITE 500E  
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001-5369  
 TELEPHONE (202) 220-1100  
 FACSIMILE (202) 220-2300

March 3, 2021

JEREMY K. BEECHER  
 MATTHEW K. DONOHUE  
 JORDAN X. NAVARRETTE  
 JOHN B. MAJOR  
 LAUREN C. BARNETT  
 C. HUNTER HAYES  
 TREVOR N. TEMPLETON  
 SKYLAR B. GROVE  
 ELIZABETH R. DYER  
 SARAH S. LEE  
 LAURA M. LOPEZ  
 MICHAEL C. BAKER  
 ADELE M. EL-KHOURI\*  
 COLIN A. DEVINE  
 DANE P. SHIKMAN  
 LEXI PEACOCK  
 MAGGIE THOMPSON  
 SAMUEL H. ALLEN  
 ALLISON M. DAY  
 JONATHAN S. MELTZER\*  
 LAUREN M. HARDING  
 NEFI D. ACOSTA  
 STEPHANIE G. HERRERA  
 TERESA RED DIPPO  
 DANIEL BENYAMIN  
 SARA A. McDERMOTT  
 J. MAX ROSEN  
 RACHEL G. MILLER-ZIEGLER\*  
 ALISON F. KAROL SIGURDSSON  
 ANNE K. CONLEY  
 KATHERINE G. INCANTALUPO  
 DAVID J. THRESDALE  
 DAVID W. MCGREGOR  
 ANDRE W. BREWSTER III  
 TERRA D. LAUGHTON  
 ROWLEY J. RICE  
 DAHLIA MIGNOUNA\*  
 SEAN P. BARRY  
 JEREMY S. KREISEL\*  
 GILBERT J. LOVITT  
 BRANDON R. TEACHOUT  
 LUCAS J. ARTAIZ  
 USHA CHILUKURI VANCE  
 TYLER HILTON  
 VIVIAN L. LUNG  
 ALEXANDER S. GORIN  
 BRENDAN GANTS\*  
 MARI T. SAIGAL  
 LAUREN E. ROSS\*

ZOE BEDELL\*  
 BENJAMIN G. BAROKH  
 JEFFREY D. DYK  
 MICHELE C. NIELSEN  
 APRIL YOUNEE-ROLL  
 DAVID T. FREENOKE  
 COBUS VAN DER VEN  
 MARIAHIA LAO  
 MEGAN MCCREADIE  
 OMAR H. NOURELDIN  
 STEPHEN HYLAS  
 ARIEL TEPFER  
 SHANNON GALVIN AMINRAD  
 LLOYD MARSHALL  
 NATALIA KARL  
 BRANDON MARTINEZ  
 ANTHONY J. RAMIREZ  
 ANDREW LEWIS  
 CARRIE G. FITTER  
 BEAU D. TREMMERE  
 ESTALYN S. MARQUIS  
 JAMES R. SALZMANN  
 ELIZABETH DOUGLAS  
 GENE HAWAII  
 ROBIN S. GRAY  
 MICA L. MOORE  
 JOSEPH MOSES

OF COUNSEL

ROBERT K. JOHNSON  
 PATRICK C. MCFEFFER, JR.  
 PETER E. DETRE  
 BRAD SCHNEIDER  
 PETER E. GRATZINGER  
 JENNY H. HONG  
 KIMBERLY A. CHI  
 ADAM R. LAWTON  
 MICHAEL E. GREANEY

E. LEROY TOLLES  
 (1922-2008)

\*ADMITTED IN D.C.  
 ALL OTHERS ADMITTED IN CA

Writer's Direct Contact  
 (213) 683-9575  
 (213) 683-5191 FAX  
 Erin.Cox@mto.com

**VIA E-FILING**

The Honorable Nicholas G. Garaufis  
 United States District Court  
 225 Cadman Plaza East  
 Brooklyn, New York 11201

Re: *Thorne et al. v. Square, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 20-cv-05119-NGG-RML: Request for Pre-Motion Conference on Square Inc. and Sutton Bank's Motion to Compel Arbitration

Dear Judge Garaufis:

This firm, together with co-counsel Hahn & Hessen LLP, represents defendant Square, Inc. ("Square") in the above captioned matter. On January 8, 2021, Square, together with defendant Sutton Bank (together, "Defendants") filed a request for a pre-motion conference regarding Defendants' anticipated motion to compel arbitration with respect to the initial Complaint filed on October 23, 2020 ("Complaint") by Plaintiff Deeann Thorne. (ECF No. 10.) This Court granted Defendants' request for a pre-motion conference on January 15, 2021. In response, on January 19, 2021 counsel for Thorne submitted a letter to this Court advising, for the first time, that they would be filing an amended complaint that would "moot" Defendants' request for a pre-motion conference. (ECF No. 22.) On January 29, 2021, Thorne's counsel filed a First Amended Complaint ("FAC"), adding three new named plaintiffs in this putative class action: Flor Alonzo, Robin Clements, and Demetrius Lovett (together with Thorne, "Plaintiffs"). (ECF No. 26.) The parties then jointly requested (i) a continuance of Defendants' deadline to respond

The Honorable Nicholas G. Garaufis  
March 3, 2021  
Page 2

to the FAC, (ii) a deadline of March 3, 2021 for Defendants to file this pre-motion conference letter in connection with their anticipated motion to compel arbitration directed at the FAC, and (iii) a stay of any deadline to file a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss pending the Court’s decision on the motion to compel arbitration. (ECF No. 27.) The Court granted the parties’ requests on February 12, 2021. (ECF No. 28.)

As with Thorne, the initial named plaintiff in this lawsuit, each of the newly added named plaintiffs agreed to arbitrate the claims they assert against Defendants in this lawsuit. Plaintiffs’ FAC does not moot either the grounds for compelling arbitration, or the need for a pre-motion conference regarding the motion to compel arbitration. For that reason, pursuant to Your Honor’s Individual Rule IV(A)(2), Defendants once again respectfully request a pre-motion conference to address Defendants’ anticipated motion to compel arbitration, this time in response to Plaintiffs’ FAC.

#### **Grounds for Defendants’ Arbitration Motion**

With the exception of the addition of the three new named plaintiffs, the allegations in the FAC remain unchanged in all material respects from those in the original Complaint. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the dispute process provisions contained in the Electronic Funds Transfer Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1693, *et seq.* in connection with allegedly fraudulent withdrawals by unknown third parties from Plaintiffs’ Cash App and Cash Card accounts.<sup>1</sup>

In signing up for their respective Cash App and Cash Card accounts, each of the four Plaintiffs entered into unambiguous agreements to arbitrate any disputes with Defendants. Accordingly, Plaintiffs should have brought their disputes in arbitration in the first instance. Under the Federal Arbitration Act (“FAA”), “in deciding whether claims are subject to arbitration, a court must consider (1) whether the parties have entered into a valid agreement to arbitrate, and, if so, (2) whether the dispute at issue comes within the scope of the arbitration agreement”—but “[b]efore addressing the second inquiry,” the court must identify whether it or the arbitrator should decide the issue. *In re Am. Express Fin. Advisors Sec. Litig.*, 672 F.3d 113, 128 (2d Cir. 2011). On this point, parties may include in a contract an “agree[ment] to arbitrate ‘gateway’ questions of ‘arbitrability’ such as whether the parties have agreed to arbitrate or whether their agreement covers a particular controversy.” *Rent-A-Ctr., W., Inc. v. Jackson*, 561 U.S. 63, 68-69 (2010). This agreement “is simply an additional, antecedent agreement the party seeking arbitration asks the federal court to enforce.” *Id.* at 69. Thus, “[t]he question of *who* is to decide whether a dispute is arbitrable is one that must necessarily precede the question of *whether* a

---

<sup>1</sup> Cash App is a mobile payment software application offered by Square Inc. that allows customers to store funds in a balance, transfer money to one another (“P2P”), buy, sell and store BitcoinCash, or make purchases using a VISA wherever VISA cards are accepted. Through the Cash App, customers may request a VISA branded “Cash Card,” or reloadable prepaid card, that is issued by Sutton Bank. *See also* FAC ¶ 24-25 (ECF No. 26).

The Honorable Nicholas G. Garaufis  
March 3, 2021  
Page 3

dispute is arbitrable.” *VRG Linhas Aereas S.A. v. MatlinPatterson Glob. Opportunities Partners II L.P.*, 717 F.3d 322, 324 (2d Cir. 2013). Here, in opening and using Cash App and Cash Card accounts, Plaintiffs entered into contracts with Defendants and in doing so agreed to arbitration. Plaintiffs likewise agreed to delegate gateway questions of arbitrability to an arbitrator.

*First*, Plaintiffs agreed to Square’s General Terms of Service and Additional Cash Terms of Service (“Square’s TOS”), which at all relevant times included an agreement to arbitrate “any and all [d]isputes,” including “any...dispute between [Plaintiffs] and Square, its processors, suppliers or licensors...including any claims relating in any way to [Square’s TOS] or the Services, or any other aspect of [Plaintiffs’] relationship” with Square. Plaintiffs also agreed to Sutton Bank’s Cash Card Terms of Service (“Sutton Bank’s TOS”), which included a similar agreement to arbitrate “any and all controversies, disputes, demands, claims, or causes of action” against Sutton Bank and also against Square.<sup>2</sup> Courts routinely enforce agreements to arbitrate like the ones Plaintiffs agreed to here. *See, e.g., Meyer v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 868 F.3d 66, 76 (2d Cir. 2017); *Feld v. Postmates, Inc.*, 442 F. Supp. 3d 825 (S.D.N.Y. 2020); *Sultan v. Coinbase, Inc.*, 354 F. Supp. 3d 156, 161 (E.D.N.Y. 2019).

*Second*, the parties have clearly and unmistakably agreed to delegate any dispute over the arbitrability of Plaintiffs’ claims to the arbitrator. *Henry Schein, Inc. v. Archer & White Sales, Inc.*, 139 S. Ct. 524, 529 (2019). At all relevant times, the parties’ arbitration agreements incorporated by reference the rules of the American Arbitration Association (“AAA”), which delegate the issue of arbitrability to the arbitrator. By incorporating the AAA rules, which “empower an arbitrator to decide issues of arbitrability, the incorporation serves as clear and unmistakable evidence of the parties’ intent to delegate such issues to an arbitrator.” *Contec Corp. v. Remote Sol., Co. LTD.*, 398 F.3d 205, 208 (2d Cir. 2005). Moreover, all Plaintiffs agreed to at least one arbitration agreement with explicit delegation language, which expressly noted that the arbitrator shall be responsible for determining all threshold arbitrability issues. Courts, including this one, have consistently upheld similar delegation clauses. *Wells Fargo Advisors, LLC v. Sappington*, 884 F.3d 392, 398 (2d Cir. 2018); *Arkin v. DoorDash, Inc.*, No. 19CV4357NGGRER, 2020 WL 4937825, at \*4–5 (E.D.N.Y., Aug. 24, 2020) (finding parties delegated issues of enforceability of the arbitration agreement to the arbitrator).

Even if this Court were to reach the arbitrability question—which it should not, because that question has been reserved for the arbitrator—the claims at issue here are covered by the arbitration agreements. Plaintiffs’ allegations relating to alleged fraudulent withdrawal of funds from Plaintiffs’ accounts, and the dispute resolution process for the Cash App and Cash Card, fall squarely within the broad arbitration provisions at issue here. Such broad arbitration

---

<sup>2</sup> At all relevant times, Sutton Bank’s TOS provided that, in agreeing to the Sutton Bank TOS, Plaintiffs were also agreeing to Square’s TOS. Each Plaintiff therefore agreed to Square’s TOS on at least two occasions: once upon registering to use the Cash App, and a second time when requesting the Cash Card linked to the Cash App.

The Honorable Nicholas G. Garaufis  
March 3, 2021  
Page 4

provisions justify a “presumption of arbitrability.” *JLM Indus., Inc. v. Stolt-Nielsen SA*, 387 F.3d 163, 172 (2d Cir. 2004); *Oldroyd v. Elmira Sav. Bank, FSB*, 134 F.3d 72, 76 (2d Cir. 1998) (enforcing clause requiring arbitration of “[a]ny dispute, controversy or claim arising under or in connection with” agreement), abrogated on other grounds by *Katz v. Cellco P’ship*, 794 F.3d 341 (2d Cir. 2015). Indeed, “[a]n order to arbitrate the particular grievance should not be denied unless it may be said with positive assurance that the arbitration clause is not susceptible of an interpretation that covers the asserted dispute.” *AT&T Techs., Inc. v. Commc’ns Workers of Am.*, 475 U.S. 643, 650 (1986).

In light of the above, Defendants respectfully renew their request for a pre-motion conference to address their anticipated motion to compel arbitration in response to the FAC.

We thank the Court for Your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ *Erin J. Cox*

Erin J. Cox

cc: Jonathan H. Blavin (admitted *pro hac vice*) (via ECF)  
Laura M. Lopez (admitted *pro hac vice*) (via ECF)  
John P. Amato (via ECF)  
Aliza Pescovitz Malouf (via ECF)  
Abigail M. Lyle (via ECF)  
Beth Terrell (via ECF)  
Daniel A. Schlanger (via ECF)